

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, and 6-16 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 6-8 were amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, and 6-16 remain at issue.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1, 4, 6-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Katsube (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,689). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed in the Response to the June 10, 2005 Office Action, claim 1 includes limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Katsube. In particular, Katsube neither discloses nor suggests “a terminal device that belongs to the network domain and has an IP address comprising a network prefix and an interface ID, said network prefix being assigned to said network domain and said interface ID being uniquely assigned within said network domain” and “a router connected to said network domain having a memory to store said interface ID paired with information of the next hop address for each terminal device in said network domain.”

The Examiner cites to column 7, lines 27-33, as support that Katsube teaches a terminal device that has an IP address comprising a network prefix and an interface ID. Katsube, however, simply discloses the information for identifying the flow (*i.e.*, the “flow ID”), including the Flow ID of the IPv6. (See col. 7, lines 27-31.) Katsube specifies that these addresses may be an address prefix indicating a network, not a node. (See col. 7, lines 32-33.) Thus, contrary to the Examiner’s statement, Katsube does not disclose or suggest an interface ID that is uniquely assigned within the network domain, as required by claim 1. As a result, Katsube does not

disclose or suggest a terminal device that belongs to the network domain and has an IP address comprising a network prefix and an interface ID, where the network prefix is assigned to the network domain and the interface ID is uniquely assigned within the network domain, as required by claim 1. In addition, because Katsube does not disclose or suggest an interface ID that is uniquely assigned within the network domain, Katsube also does not disclose or suggest a router connected to the network domain having a memory to store the interface ID paired with information of the next hop address for each terminal device in the network domain, as required by claim 1.


Accordingly, claim 1, and claim 4 that depends from claim 1, are allowable over Katsube. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-16 are also allowable over Katsube. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 9, 2006

By:   
Marina N. Saito  
Registration No. 42,121  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000